



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/651,680	08/30/2000	Anil K. Goyal	410093.401	2023
22504	7590	04/13/2004	EXAMINER	
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE, LLP 2600 CENTURY SQUARE 1501 FOURTH AVENUE SEATTLE, WA 98101-1688			PASS, NATALIE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3626	

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/651,680

Applicant(s)

GOYAL, ANIL K.

Examiner

Natalie A. Pass

Art Unit

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed 30 January 2004. Claims 1, 4-7, 11-12, 16-17, 20 and 23 have been amended. Claims 1-27 remain pending.

Specification

2. The objection to the abstract of the disclosure because of undue length is hereby withdrawn due to the amendment filed 30 January 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §101

3. The rejection of claims 1, 4-7, 10-12, 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. §101 is hereby withdrawn due to the amendment filed 30 January 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-18, 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
COMPUTER CRIMES AND THE *RESPONDEAT SUPERIOR* DOCTRINE: *EMPLOYERS*
BEWARE! Article, by M. Ishman, Spring 2000, URLs:

<http://www.ishmanlaw.com/resources/Respondeat_Superior.pdf>,

<<http://www.bu.edu/law/scitech/volume6/Ishman.htm>>, and

<<http://www.bu.edu/law/scitech/OLJ6.htm>>, hereinafter known as Ishman, and further in view
of For Your Information article, by C. Ott, August 3, 1999. URL:

<http://archive.salon.com/tech/feature/1999/08/03/info_markets/print.html>, hereinafter known
as Ott and further in view of Sloo, U.S. Patent Number 5, 895, 450.

(A) Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

"electronically" on lines 3 and 14;

"select a positive rating category or a negative rating category for the user-selected
entity" on lines 6-7;

"provide a quantifiable indication of user satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the user-
selected entity" on lines 9-10;

"and the value of the monetary contributions and selections of the positive rating category
and the negative rating category" on lines 19-20.

As per these new limitations, Ishman and Ott teach a method as analyzed and disclosed in
the previous Office Action (paper number 3) further comprising

electronically communicating with a service provider (Ishman; page 13, line 10 to page 16, line 22);

provide a quantifiable indication of user satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the user-selected entity (Ishman; page 13, line 10 to page 16, line 22);

retrieve stored data from the service provider related to the user-selected entity and the value of the monetary contributions (Ott; page 1, paragraphs 1-2, 4, 6, page 2, paragraphs 9-11, page 3, paragraphs 1-3 and 6-8), (Ishman; page 13, line 10 to page 16, line 22).

Although Ishman and Ott teach selecting categories (Ishman; page 36, lines 24-52), Ishman and Ott fail to explicitly disclose select a positive rating category or a negative rating category for the user-selected entity.

However, the above features are well-known in the art, as evidenced by Sloo.

In particular, Sloo teaches select a positive rating category or a negative rating category for the user-selected entity (Sloo; column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line 59 to column 9, line 10, column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-24, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 15, lines 1-5, column 18, lines 16-17)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method for consumer recording and publicly reporting monetary commentary of Ishman and Ott to include select a positive rating category or a negative rating category for the user-selected entity, as taught by Sloo, with the motivations of producing ratings

Art Unit: 3626

that can be used to affect outcomes and for other purposes to hold the parties or entities accountable for their conduct, providing public access to data records to permit viewing of complaints, responses, and settlements for allowing other users to gauge the conduct of the subjects or entities, and for producing performance ratings or scores that will prejudice the user during future interactions such as when attempting to resolve or evaluate future disputes, with a lower performance rating or score decreasing the likelihood of a favorable outcome for the party or entity (Sloo; column 2, lines 6-20, column 12, lines 6-14).

The motivations for combining the respective teachings of Ishman and Ott are as given in the rejection of claim 1 in the prior Office Action (paper number 3) and incorporated herein.

The remainder of claim 1 is rejected for the same reasons given in the prior Office Action (paper number 3, section 6, pages 4-6), and incorporated herein.

(B) Claim 5 has been amended to recite:

"contribution and selection of the positive rating category and the negative rating category" in lines 4-5.

As per newly amended claim 5, Ishman, Ott and Sloo teach a method as analyzed and discussed in claim 1 above, further comprising graphical data indicating the value of the monetary contribution and selection of the positive rating category and the negative rating category (Ishman; page 3, footnote 15, page 37, footnote 309), (Sloo; column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line 59 to column 9, line 10, column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-24, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 15, lines 1-5, column 18, lines 16-17).

(C) Claim 7 has been amended to recite:

"electronically" on line 3;

"select a positive rating category or a negative rating category for the user-selected entity" on lines 5-6.

As per these new limitations, Ishman and Ott teach a method as analyzed and disclosed in the previous Office Action (paper number 3) further comprising

electronically communicating with a service provider (Ishman; page 13, line 10 to page 16, line 22).

Although Ishman and Ott teach selecting categories (Ishman; page 36, lines 24-52), Ishman and Ott fail to explicitly disclose select a positive rating category or a negative rating category for the user-selected entity.

Sloo teaches select a positive rating category or a negative rating category for the user-selected entity (Sloo; column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line 59 to column 9, line 10, column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-24, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 15, lines 1-5, column 18, lines 16-17).

The motivations for combining the respective teachings of Ishman, Ott and Sloo are as given in the rejection of claim 1 above and in the prior Office Action (paper number 3) and incorporated herein.

The remainder of claim 7 is rejected for the same reasons given in the prior Office Action (paper number 3, section 6, pages 6-7), and incorporated herein.

(D) Claim 12 has been amended to include:

"electronically" on line 3;

"indicating the respective selection of each of the consumers of a positive rating category or a negative rating category" on lines 8-9; and

"selections of the rating category" on lines 11-12.

As per these new limitations, Ishman and Ott teach a method as analyzed and disclosed in the previous Office Action (paper number 3) further comprising

electronically communicating with a plurality of consumers (Ishman; page 13, line 10 to page 16, line 22).

Ishman and Ott fail to explicitly disclose

indicating the respective selection of each of the consumers of a positive rating category or a negative rating category.

Sloo teaches indicating the respective selection of each of the consumers of a positive rating category or a negative rating category (Sloo; column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line 59 to column 9, line 10, column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-24, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 15, lines 1-5, column 18, lines 16-17).

The motivations for combining the respective teachings of Ishman, Ott and Sloo are as given in the rejection of claim 1 above and in the prior Office Action (paper number 3) and incorporated herein.

The remainder of claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons given in the prior Office Action (paper number 3, section 6, pages 7-8), and incorporated herein.

(E) Claim 20 has been amended to recite:

"permit user selection" on lines 6-7;

" to permit user selection of a positive rating category or a negative rating category for the user-selected entity" on lines 6-7; and

"selection of the rating category" on line 13.

As per these new limitations, Ishman and Ott teach a system as analyzed and disclosed in the previous Office Action (paper number 3) further comprising

permit user selection of an entity (Ott; page 1, paragraphs 1-2, 4, 6, page 2, paragraphs 9-11, page 3, paragraphs 1-3 and 6-8);

user selection of the rating category (Ishman; page 36, lines 24-52), (Ott; page 1, paragraphs 1-2, 4, 6, page 2, paragraphs 9-11, page 3, paragraphs 1-3 and 6-8).

Although Ishman and Ott teach selecting categories (Ishman; page 36, lines 24-52), Ishman and Ott fail to explicitly disclose

to permit user selection of a positive rating category or a negative rating category for the user-selected entity.

Sloo teaches to permit user selection of a positive rating category or a negative rating category for the user-selected entity (Sloo; column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line 59 to column 9, line 10, column 11, line 63 to

Art Unit: 3626

column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-24, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 15, lines 1-5, column 18, lines 16-17).

The motivations for combining the respective teachings of Ishman, Ott and Sloo are as given in the rejection of claim 1 above and in the prior Office Action (paper number 3) and incorporated herein.

The remainder of claim 20 is rejected for the same reasons given in the prior Office Action (paper number 3, section 6, pages 8-9), and incorporated herein.

(F) The amendments to claims 4, 6, 11, 16-17, and 23 appear to have been made merely to correct minor typographical or grammatical errors. While these changes render the language of the claims smoother and more consistent, they otherwise affect neither the scope and breadth of the claims as originally presented nor the manner in which the claims were interpreted by the Examiner when applying prior art within the previous Office Action.

As such, the recited claimed features are rejected for the same reasons given in the prior Office Action (paper number 3, section 6, pages 9-12), and incorporated herein.

(G) Claims 2-3, 8-10, 13-15, 18, 21-22, 24-26 have not been amended and are rejected for the same reasons given in the previous Office Action (paper number 3, section 6, pages 9-12), and incorporated herein.

6. Claims 19 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
COMPUTER CRIMES AND THE *RESPONDEAT SUPERIOR* DOCTRINE: *EMPLOYERS*

Art Unit: 3626

BEWARE! Article, by M. Ishman, Spring 2000, URLs:

<http://www.ishmanlaw.com/resources/Respondeat_Superior.pdf>,

<<http://www.bu.edu/law/scitech/volume6/Ishman.htm>>, and

<<http://www.bu.edu/law/scitech/OLJ6.htm>>, hereinafter known as Ishman, and For Your

Information article, by C. Ott, August 3, 1999. URL:

<http://archive.salon.com/tech/feature/1999/08/03/info_markets/print.html>, hereinafter known

as Ott, as applied to claims 12 and 20 above, and further in view of Official Notice for

substantially the same reasons given in the previous Office Action (paper number 3), and further

in view of Sloo, U.S. Patent Number 5, 895, 450. Further reasons appear hereinbelow.

(A) Claims 19 and 27 have not been amended and are rejected for the same reasons given in the previous Office Action (paper number 3, section 7, pages 12-13), and incorporated herein.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 30 January 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments will be addressed hereinbelow in the order in which they appear in the responses filed 30 January 2004.

(A) At page 9 of the 30 January 2004 response, Applicant states that claims 1-18 and 20-26 stand rejected under 35 USC § 108. Examiner respectfully notes that the rejection of these claims was under 35 USC § 103.

(B) At pages 9-10 of the 30 January 2004 response, Applicant argues that the features in the Application are not taught or suggested by the applied references. In response, all of the limitations which Applicant disputes as missing in the applied references, including the newly added features in the 30 January 2004 amendment, have been fully addressed by the Examiner as either being fully disclosed or obvious in view of the collective teachings of Ishman, Ott and Sloo, based on the logic and sound scientific reasoning of one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention, as detailed in the remarks and explanations given in the preceding sections of the present Office Action and in the prior Office Action (paper number 3), and incorporated herein. In particular, Examiner notes that the recited features of selecting an entity and selecting a category and providing an indication of user satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the user-selected entity and whereby a user electronically communicates with a service provider and provides a monetary contribution to the service provider are taught by the combination of applied references (Ishman; page 13, line 10 to page 16, line 22, page 36, lines 24-52), (Ott; page 1, paragraphs 1-2, 4, 6, page 2, paragraphs 9-11, page 3, paragraphs 1-3 and 6-8), (Sloo; column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line 59 to column 9, line 10, column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-24, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 15, lines 1-5, column 18, lines 16-17).

Art Unit: 3626

(C) At pages 10-14 of the 30 January 2004 response, Applicant argues the applied references separately and argues each of the references individually. In response to Applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed Cir. 1986). In addition, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). In particular, as demonstrated in the rejections of newly amended claims 1, 4-7, 11-12, 16-17, 20 and 23, the combined cited references of Ishman, Ott and Sloo teach electronically communicating with a service provider to permit a user to select an entity (Ishman; page 13, line 10 to page 16, line 22); select a positive rating category or a negative rating category for the user-selected entity (Sloo; column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line 59 to column 9, line 10, column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-24, column 14, line 60 to column 15, line 40, column 15, lines 1-5, column 18, lines 16-17); provide a monetary contribution to the service provider to provide a quantifiable indication of user satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the user-selected entity (Ott; page 1, paragraphs 1-2, 4, 6, page 2, paragraphs 9-11, page 3, paragraphs 1-3 and 6-8), storing data related to the user-selected entity, (Ishman; page 13, line 10 to page 16, line 22); and retrieving stored data from the service provider related to the reputation of the user-selected

Art Unit: 3626

entity (Ishman; page 13, line 10 to page 16, line 22); and retrieve stored data from the service provider related to the user-selected entity and the value of the monetary contributions and selections of the positive rating category and the negative rating category (Ott; page 1, paragraphs 1-2, 4, 6, page 2, paragraphs 9-11, page 3, paragraphs 1-3 and 6-8), (Ishman; page 13, line 10 to page 16, line 22), (Sloo; column 3, lines 7-17, column 5, line 56 to column 6, line 4, column 6, lines 46-67, column 8, line 59 to column 9, line 10, column 11, line 63 to column 12, line 5, column 12, lines 15-24, column 14, line 45 to column 15, line 40, column 15, lines 1-5, column 18, lines 16-17).

(D) With regards to Applicant's contention at page 11 of the 30 January 2004 response that the applied cited references do not suggest graphical representation of data, Examiner notes that Ishman observes that graphical representation of data is well known in the art (Ishman; page 3, footnote 15, page 37, footnote 309), and that Ott's system comments on the "Web's vast array of freely available information," (Ott; page 1, paragraph 2) which is known to one of ordinary skill in the art to include data represented in a graphical manner.

(E) With regards to Applicant's contention at page 11 of the 30 January 2004 response that the applied cited references do not suggest a selection of positive or negative rating categories for user-selected entity, Examiner notes that Sloo's teaching of "[t]he complaint handling apparatus and method may also include introduction of satisfaction data to the complaint handling apparatus process ... monitors and records participant's satisfaction using any of a number of methods ... enables satisfaction input to be associated or linked to other

recorded input ... adding to profiles or records of objects, may aid the complaint handling apparatus in identifying objects and making its decisions during the complaint handling apparatus processes" and "satisfaction data may be used by the complaint handling apparatus as evidence by which better judgments and decisions can be made. Satisfaction data, like other recorded data, would be made available to third parties or factored into the complaint handling apparatus" (Sloo; column 14, lines 45-67) reads on a selection of positive or negative rating categories for user-selected entity.

(F) With regards to Applicant's contention at page 11 of the 30 January 2004 response that the applied cited references do not suggest providing a monetary payment to a service provider, Examiner notes that Ott's teaches this feature (Ott; page 1, paragraphs 1-2, 4, 6, page 2, paragraphs 9-11, page 3, paragraphs 1-3 and 6-8), and in addition, Sloo's teaching of "[a]t any time during the use of the apparatus, the program may require any of the users to pay a fee. For example, the program may require a user to pay a fee before posting a complaint or require a subject to pay a fee before posting a response to a complaint" (Sloo; column 12, lines 15-24) reads on providing a monetary payment to a service provider.

(G) With regards to Applicant's contention at page 12 of the 30 January 2004 response that the applied cited references do not suggest electronically communicating with a plurality of consumers to alter a reputation of an identified entity Ishman's discussion of Internet and electronic bulletin boards and newsgroups that manipulate investors and alter reputations of identified businesses (Ishman; page 13, line 10 to page 16, line 22) reads on this feature, as does

Art Unit: 3626

Sloo's teaching of "[t]he central computer is also programmed to provide public access to the data records to permit viewing of the corresponding complaints, responses, and settlements for allowing other users to gauge the conduct of the subjects and to encourage the subjects to respond to the complaints in a timely and satisfactory manner. Moreover, the central computer is programmed to monitor and rate the conduct and performance of both the complainants and the subjects ...[...]. The ratings can be used to affect the outcome ...[...]. to hold the parties accountable for their conduct ...[...]."

(Sloo; column 2, lines 7-20) reads on electronically communicating with a plurality of consumers to alter a reputation of an identified entity.

(H) With regards to Applicant's contention at pages 13-14 of the 30 January 2004 response that the applied cited references do not suggest a data structure associated with the server to store data related to the user-selected entity, Ott's teaching of the client-server architecture of the Web, (Ott; page 1, paragraphs 1-2, 4, 6, page 2, paragraphs 9-11, page 3, paragraphs 1-3 and 6-8), as noted by Applicant, reads on a data structure associated with the server to store data related to the user-selected entity, as does Sloo's teaching of "The mark-up language cooperates with a standard server language such as Common Gateway Interface (CGI) or Practical Extraction and Report Language (PERL) for handling the various operating functions of the central computer"(Sloo; column 3, lines 54-59).

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied prior art teaches Internet methods for reporting public opinions ("The Internet and the Online Investor: SEC Educational Efforts and Enforcement Activities" in Securities in the Electronic Age: A Practical Guide to the Law and Regulation, Glasser LegalWorks: 2000, (eds. John F. Olson and Harvey L. Pitt) (Harvey L. Pitt, Mark J. Dorsey, Peter H. Schwartz and Tasha L. Cooper) [Retrieved on April 7, 2004]. Retrieved from Internet. URL: <<http://www.dgslaw.com/articles/317470.html>>.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. **Any response to this final action should be mailed to:**

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington D.C. 20231

Art Unit: 3626

or faxed to:

(703) 305-7687.

For formal communications, please mark
"EXPEDITED PROCEDURE".

For informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" on the front page of the
communication and do NOT sign the communication.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5,
2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Seventh Floor (Receptionist).


11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Natalie A. Pass whose telephone number is (703) 305-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 AM to 6:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

12. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas, can be reached at (703) 305-9588. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.



Natalie A. Pass

April 7, 2004


JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600